APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/425,177	10/22/1999	MICHAEL CARROLL	52817.000102	9182

29315   7590   06/28/2004

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 April 2004_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 4/08/04.

2.   The rejection of claims 1, 5-7, 9, 13, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Introducing Microsoft Windows 95 "Manual" in view of Microsoft Windows

95 application "screenshots" has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

3.   The rejection of claims 2-4, 8, 10-12, 14, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over "Microsoft - Manual" in view of "Windows 95 - screenshots" and in further

view Greyson has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

4.   Claims 21-22 are newly added. Claims 1-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 16, 17,

21, and 22 are independent claims.

Drawings

5.   The drawings filed on 10/22/99 are objected to as indicated in the attached PTO-948

form. Formal corrected drawings can be filed at allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 13, 15-18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sybex, Inc. "The ABCs of Word 97", 1997, Second Edition, pages 10-12 and pages 43-44 (herein after "Sybex") in view of Microsoft Word 97 application "screenshots", 1997, Microsoft Corporation, pages 1-5 (herein after "Word 97").**

Regarding independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 21-22, Sybex discloses:

A method of processing at least two associated target information regions within an electronic document generated by a word-processing application, the method comprising the steps of:

accepting input to select a continuous target information region within the electronic document; accepting input to process the associated target information regions (Sybex pages 43-44 teaches for the user to apply bold, italic, or underline, the user needs to select the text, then click on Bold, Italic, or Underline button on the Formatting toolbar. When the user applies one of these attributes, the relevant button will appear pushed in; furthermore, the user can remove bold, italic, or underline by selecting the emphasized text, then click the relevant button again to remove formatting).

However, Sybex does not explicitly disclose, "deselect at least one portion of the continuous target information region to form the at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions".

Word 97 does disclose "deselect at least one portion of the continuous target information region to form the at least two associated noncontiguous target information regions", on page 2 shows the user can select a region; on page 3 shows the user can click on the "Bold" button from the formatting toolbar to apply "Bold" on the selected region; on page 4 shows the user can

select a region or word within the region that has been bolded to remove the bold (deselect portion); and on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex to provide a way to remove bold (deselect) within a bolded region, as shown by Word 97, incorporated into the formatting process of Sybex, in order to provide a quick way to apply formatting options within a word-processing document.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 10, and 18, Sybex discloses:

wherein the contiguous target information regions comprises text (Sybex pages 43-44 teaches the formatting process is done on text within a word-processing document).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Word 97 discloses:

accepting input for creating additional associated noncontiguous target information regions (Word 97 on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex to provide a way to remove bold (deselect) within a bolded region, as shown by Word 97, incorporated into the formatting process of Sybex, in order to provide a quick way to apply formatting options within a word-processing document.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Word 97 discloses:

accepting further input to change content of the at least two associated target information regions (Word 97 on page 2 shows the user can select a region and on page 3 shows the user can

click on the "Bold" button from the formatting toolbar to apply "Bold" on the selected region, in

other words, the word-processing application can let the user change content).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex to provide a way to remove bold

(deselect) within a bolded region, as shown by Word 97, incorporated into the formatting process

of Sybex, in order to provide a quick way to apply formatting options within a word-processing

document.

Regarding dependent claims 7 and 15, Sybex discloses:

wherein the electronic document comprises graphical information (Sybex on pages 10-12

teaches the user can insert graphics or pictures into the word-processing document).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Sybex discloses:

wherein the input interface accepts input from at least one of a keyboard, a speech to text

converter, a mouse, a pressure pad and a trackball device (Sybex on pages 10-12 and pages 43-

44 the input function can be performed using the keyboard or mouse).

Regarding independent claim 17, Sybex discloses:

A system for processing noncontiguous target information within an electronic document, the

system comprising:

input means to accept input for selecting a contiguous target information region and

processor means for processing the target information regions, said processor means operatively

connected to the input means (Sybex pages 43-44 teaches for the user to apply bold, italic, or

underline, the user needs to select the text, then click on Bold, Italic, or Underline button on the

Formatting toolbar. When the user applies one of these attributes, the relevant button will appear

pushed in; furthermore, the user can remove bold, italic, or underline by selecting the

emphasized text, then click the relevant button again to remove formatting).

However, Sybex does not explicitly disclose "selecting at least one information

separating region that divides the continuous target information region into at least two

associated noncontiguous target information regions".

Word 97 on page 3 shows the user can click on the "Bold" button from the formatting

toolbar to apply "Bold" on the selected region; on page 4 shows the user can select a region or

word within the region that has been bolded to remove the bold; and on page 5 shows forming

two associated noncontiguous bolded regions, in other words, the user selects a region to

"unbold" within a bolded region forming two bolded regions.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex to provide a way to remove bold

within a bolded region to form two bolded regions, as shown by Word 97, incorporated into the

formatting process of Sybex, in order to provide a quick way to apply formatting options within

a word-processing document.

8.   **Claims 3-4, 8, 11-12, 14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over "Sybex" in view of "Word 97", as applied to claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 13, 15-
18, and 21-22 above, in further view Greyson et al. (USPN 5,666,552 – issued on 09/1997).
Regarding dependent claim 3,** Sybex and Word 97 disclose the invention substantially as

claimed as described above. However, Sybex and Word 97 do not explicitly disclose "first begin

select delimiter located left of the target information and a first end select delimiter located right

of the continuous target information region".

Greyson et al. (Greyson) on col. 5, line 43 – col. 6, line 28: teaches initial and final

selection point of the selection region.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Greyson into Sybex and Word 97 to provide a way to point

the selection region with initial and final selection point, as taught by Greyson, incorporated into

the selection of text within a word-processing document, as taught by Sybex and Word 97, in

order to directly and visually manipulate text on a computer display screen requiring user control

activations thereby simplifying the user interface.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Greyson discloses:

accepting input to deselect at least one portion of the target information region comprises

storing locations of a second end select delimiter that is located between the first begin select

delimiter and first end select delimiter and a second begin select delimiter that is between the

second and first end select delimiters (Greyson on col. 5, line 43 – col. 6, line 28: teaches

extending from the initial selection point to the final selection point of the selection region;

wherein using the cursor will define the bounds of the selection region).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Greyson into Sybex and Word 97 to provide a way to point

the selection region with initial and final selection point, as taught by Greyson, incorporated into

the selection of text within a word-processing document, as taught by Sybex and Word 97, in

order to directly and visually manipulate text on a computer display screen requiring user control

activations thereby simplifying the user interface.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Greyson discloses:

each rectangle having two delimiter tags located at opposite corners (Greyson on col. 5,

line 56 – col. 6, line 28: teaches highlighting (visually show as a rectangle) the selected text

region visually indicates the selection).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Greyson into Sybex and Word 97 to provide a way to point

the selection region with initial and final selection point, as taught by Greyson, incorporated into

the selection of text within a word-processing document, as taught by Sybex and Word 97, in

order to directly and visually manipulate text on a computer display screen requiring user control

activations thereby simplifying the user interface.

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 19, Greyson discloses:

wherein the processor unit stores a begin tag and an end tag for each of the target

information regions (Greyson on col. 5, line 43 – col. 6, line 28: teaches initial (begin tag) and

final (end tag) selection point of the selection region).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Greyson into Sybex and Word 97 to provide a way to point

the selection region with initial and final selection point, as taught by Greyson, incorporated into

the selection of text within a word-processing document, as taught by Sybex and Word 97, in

order to directly and visually manipulate text on a computer display screen requiring user control

activations thereby simplifying the user interface.

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 20, Word 97 discloses:

further comprising an output interface to transmit a display that shows at least two

associated noncontiguous target information regions in a different manner than the at least one

deselected portion of the continuous target information region (Word 97 page 4 shows the user

can select a region or word within the region that has been bolded to remove the bold (deselect

portion); and on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex and Greyson to provide a way to

remove bold within a bolded region forming two noncontiguous bolded portions, as taught by

Word 97, incorporated into the selection of a text, as taught by Sybex and Greyson, in order to

directly and visually manipulate text or symbols on a computer display screen.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Word 97 discloses:

wherein the input interface receives input for a positional indicator and the processor unit

selects information when the positional indicator is moved in a first direction and deselects

information when the positional indicator is moved in a second direction (Word 97 page 4 shows

the user can select a region or word within the region that has been bolded to remove the bold

(deselect portion); and on page 5 shows forming two associated noncontiguous bolded regions

and shows a positional indicator; wherein the indicator can move in any direction by using the

mouse).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Word 97 into Sybex and Greyson to provide a way to

remove bold within a bolded region forming two noncontiguous bolded portions, as taught by

Word 97, incorporated into the selection of a text, as taught by Sybex and Greyson, in order to

directly and visually manipulate text or symbols on a computer display screen.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by amendment.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on pages 7-8:

The combination of Sybex Word 97 Manual and Word 97 screenshots (see rejection

above) teaches and shows the amended claimed invention within a word-processing application

environment.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 8:

Referring to the Greyson reference, the new combination of Sybex, Word 97, and

Greyson is proper because it's within the word-processing application environment.

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 703-305-5945. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AY
June 22, 2004